

was resolved very casually indeed. Many believe Rodman should have been suspended for the entire season. That would have been an appropriate conclusion.

Rodman was seen laughing about the incident and one of his teammates complained that the cameraman should have more promptly removed himself from the arena floor.

One is a victim of a senseless assault and battery and the victim should jump to his feet and promptly apologize to his attacker? Hardly.

The attitude of many of these NBA stars is reprehensible, Mr. Speaker. Some recent years ago an NBA star was accused of improper involvement with gambling interests and possible involvement with organized crime. His response was that most people did not appreciate the pressure that surrounded his life.

□ 1245

I have news for this self-appointed celebrity. He does not know the meaning of pressure. The guy under pressure is working for \$9 an hour, who wants to purchase his son a ticket so he can watch these millionaire athletes display their wares on the hardwood. I am told that fewer fans, Mr. Speaker, are viewing televised NBA games. This may not be supported by polling data, but common sense tells me that many Americans are fed up with the condescending attitude expressed by these overnight millionaires.

Perhaps they should have to try their luck at \$9-an-hour jobs. Then maybe they would appreciate the fact that fans who pay their hard-earned money deserve more respect. They might then appreciate the fact that millionaire athletes, or celebrities, are indeed role models. They are not required to be good role models, but they cannot on the one hand warmly embrace their money, fame, and celebrity status, and then on the other hand reject their casting as role models. It does not work that way, fellas, and this is the climate which the NBA is now extending to high school graduates.

I was recently asked, Mr. Speaker, if I would pay to attend an NBA game. One team has regional exposure to my congressional district; another team is coached by a good friend of mine. Aside from these two teams, I would pay to watch only one team in the NBA. That team has never won an NBA title, although they annually advance well into the playoff season, but no cigar is awarded. But this team is a class organization and if more NBA teams would emulate them, there would likely be an increase in spectator interest.

If these self-serving overpaid athletes do not get their acts together, spectator interest will continue to wane and perhaps they will have the chance at one of those \$9-an-hour jobs, and then, Mr. Speaker, they will really know what pressure is.

SUPPORT FOR A BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full 5 minutes, although I will yield to a colleague after I say a few words about the bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act.

This is an issue that has been with us since the founding of our democracy. I happen to represent northern Virginia, the home of George Washington at Mount Vernon. Some of my colleagues may not be aware that the first time that George Washington ran for office he was defeated. He ran for the House of Delegates for Virginia and he lost. His advisers came to him after he lost and said, "General Washington, the problem is that you did not treat." They explained that the custom is to distribute whiskey to the landowners on election day. Sure enough, next election, he treated and he won overwhelmingly.

James Madison had the same problem. He did not learn from George Washington's experience and he lost, and then he went back to treating. Treating led to what they called macing, where essentially a candidate would dun the members of his political party for contributions. Well, one thing led to another, and now we have a system that is in desperate need of another major reform.

We have had many reforms. The 1974 reform was one such major reform. In fact, let me quote from Lyndon Johnson in 1967. In a special address to this Congress, he said, "Our current campaign finance laws are inadequate in scope and now obsolete. More loophole than law, they invite evasion and circumvention."

It took 7 years and the Watergate break-ins before Congress passed real reform. Those words, though, are equally true today. We have got to reform campaign finance law. It is corrupting the political process as well as the legislative process.

We have a bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act, terrific people on both sides of the aisle are cosponsoring it. We have the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL], the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], and the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE]. I can go on and on. And these Republican Members are in addition to a long list of Democratic cosponsors.

One of those folks, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WAMP], is one of the Republican sponsors. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to Mr. WAMP now to conclude my 5 minutes.

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I have to say in opening I am from Chattanooga, TN, home of the Cin-

derella team this year in the Sweet 16, the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, the Moccasins; the Mockingbirds, excuse me. We have changed our name.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, the businessman from Texas, Mr. Ross Perot, who sometimes I agree with, sometimes I may not, but he said that we have good people in Washington trapped in a bad system. I certainly believe that there are good people serving in the U.S. Congress but the system of campaign reform, which has not changed since 1974, needs to be changed.

There is no perfect bill, there is no silver bullet, there is no magic solution. It is very complex, but it is a bipartisan problem. This week the Democrats may be in more trouble on this issue than the Republicans, but who is to say that the system may not swing the other way. I really believe neither party has an exclusive on integrity or an exclusive on ideas. This is a problem that both parties share.

Some basic principles we should agree on and change is that a majority of our money in campaigns should come from our home States; that the influence of special interest political action committees should be reduced; that we should ban soft money, corporate contributions to the political parties that are funneled back into media advertising should be eliminated; and that we should somehow work to reduce the overall money spent on political campaigns in America.

I think we can agree on those basic principles. Conflict, Mr. Speaker, brings about resolution, and we have a conflict in this country. Yes, every day there is new revelations, but it is time to use these conflicts to bring about change. There is no perfect solution, but we must agree on some basic principles, come together in a bipartisan way.

I do not agree with everything in the bipartisan campaign bill but I believe we can change it and improve it as we go. The issue is, will we defend the status quo again this year in this body, or will we come together and change this system for the first time in 23 years? The status quo obviously is not serving us well in campaign laws. Reform is in order.

If Members have ideas, if they have disagreements, come to the reform movement. Do not fight it or look the other way or make excuses to get by any longer.

ENDING FEDERAL RACE AND GENDER PREFERENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I rise to address legislation I will soon introduce to end